

SCORE SHEET FOR TRACK ONE RFPs WITH REGIONAL PRIORITIES

**FY13-FY14 Region Reg1 Wetland Program Development Grants
EPA-REG1 -13-14
Evaluation Form**

Applicant: B-CT-01

Reviewer: W

Total Score (out of 125 points): 87/125

| CRITERION | SUB-CRITERION | AVAILABLE POINTS | SCORE |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|-------|
| ONE | | 15 | 6 |
| TWO | | 10 | 10 |
| THREE | | 5 | 0 |
| FOUR | A.1 | 5 | 5 |
| | A.2 | 5 | 5 |
| | A.3 | 5 | 5 |
| | B | 5 | 1 |
| FIVE | A | 20 | 10 |
| | B | 5 | 5 |
| | C | 5 | 5 |
| SIX | A | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| | B | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| SEVEN | | 15 | 15 |
| EIGHT | | 5 | 5 |
| NINE | i | 5 | 5 |
| | ii | 5 | 5 |

\$ 300,000

-9

-5

-4

-10

-10

Application Evaluation

CRITERION ONE: National Priority Area: Wetland Program Development and WPPs (15 points)

8 (0 - 15 points)

Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the applicant: 1) proposes to develop a WPP consistent with the objectives and guidelines described in Section I. C, PRIORITY AREAS AND TRACK CONCEPT and in addition, if applicable, the proposal will also be evaluated to the extent it describes one or more core elements(s) and associated action(s) (see Appendix A) that the applicant proposes to

carry out or 2) describes which grant-eligible actions from an EPA-approved WPP the applicant proposes to carry out and how they will do so.

Comments The applicant lists the numbered objectives and associated numbered actions and activities, but does not identify the actions (or objectives) by name. (-2)
Applicant describes some activities/actions (1.8), but not all (-5)

CRITERION TWO: Project Need (10 points)

10 (0 - 10 points) Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the applicant demonstrates the need for the project as it pertains to developing or refining a state/tribal/local government wetland program.

Comments The applicant thoroughly describes the need for this program to build and refine their annual training program. Because CT's wetland protection occurs at a local level, this training program is central to wetlands protection and key component in the continued development of local wetlands programs.

CRITERION THREE: Regional Priority Areas (5 points)

0 (0 - 5 points) Applicants will be evaluated based on how well the proposed project addresses the Regional Priority.

Comments The proposal incorrectly addresses the regional priority as "regulatory." The Regional priority is not "regulatory," it is to ensure that wetland complexes of high ecological value, etc., that provide resilience for wetland impacts from climate change are protected across New England.

CRITERION FOUR: Environmental Results: Outputs, Outcomes, and Tracking (20 points)

Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the proposal demonstrates each of following:

5 (0 - 5 points) (A.1) Description of how the applicant expects to achieve the expected project outputs (products).

Comments Proposed outputs are well-described/explained by the applicant. The outputs are achievable.

5 (0 - 5 points) (A.2) Description of how the applicant expects to achieve the expected project outcomes (objectives) and how the project's outcomes will be used to develop or refine a state or tribal wetland program (i.e., how likely is it that the project will increase protection of wetland resources or increase knowledge of an applicant's wetland resources)?

Comments The applicant adequately describes the outcomes and that the expected outcomes will, by improving the knowledge and decision-making ability at local level, lead to increased protection of CT's wetland resources

5 (0 - 5 points) (A.3) Description of how the proposed project's objectives and outcomes are aligned with the EPA Strategic Plan Goal of achieving a net increase in wetland acres with a focus on assessment of wetland condition?

Comments The applicant presents a thorough explanation of how the proposed project is aligned w/ EPA strategic Plan Goal and states that CT's wetlands strategic goal and EPA's Goal mirror one another. It is clear through refining the training program and informing local wetlands program managers on latest laws, policies, and field techniques will translate into increased wetlands protection and acres.

1 (0 - 5 points) (B) Tracking Outputs and Outcomes: Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on how well their proposal demonstrates a sound plan for measuring and tracking their progress toward achieving the expected project outputs and outcomes?

Comments Although the applicant provided unrelated information for tracking such as item number 3 (Continuing education will provide an opportunity for municipal inland wetland agency members and staff to complement their knowledge and training) (-4), other items were identified (i.e., reports summarizing number of participants at trainings, and status & Trends report) will aid in tracking. (+1).

CRITERION FIVE: Tasks/Milestone Schedule/Detailed Budget Narrative (30 points)

Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which the proposal demonstrates the following:

20 (0 - 20 points) (A) A clear description of project tasks and associated products and whether the applicant's approach (methodology) or the steps proposed to develop an approach is sound.

Comments The applicant adequately describes task and products. The approach is sound and proposed outputs achievable (+10) However, the actual topics of the training programs and materials is undefined (-10) Also, the inclusion of developing a format for municipal regulations was thought to have already occurred

5 (0 - 5 points) (B) A clearly articulated milestone schedule that shows a breakout of the project into phases by associated task and a timeline for completion of the tasks including the anticipated dates for the start and completion of each task. In addition, whether there is a clearly articulated approach to ensure that awarded funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner will also be evaluated.

Comments The applicant clearly articulates each phase of the proposed project noting when each phase begins and ends. Based on this schedule, it appears that funds would be expended in timely and efficient manner.

5 (0 - 5 points) (C) The adequacy of the information provided in the detailed budget and whether the proposed costs are reasonable and allowable including whether: the applicant identified the requested federal dollars and the total project cost for each component/task for each budget item from Form 424A; the applicant explained if and how non-federal partners will provide cost share/match and demonstrated the cost-effectiveness and reasonableness of costs and the value of in-kind contributions.

Comments The budget detail is adequate and proposed costs are reasonable and allowable. The applicant identified the requested total federal dollars and total project cost for each component of budget item on SF 424A, and explained how non-federal partners will provide cost/share match.

CRITERION SIX: Programmatic Capability/Technical Experience/Qualifications (15 points)

Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on the applicant's ability to successfully manage and complete the proposed project taking into account the applicant's:

7.5 (0 - 7.5 points) (A) Experience related to the proposed project, and their readiness and ability to implement the proposed project in a successful and timely manner.

Comments The applicant ^{demonstrates they are} is well-positioned and experienced to execute this proposal in a timely and successful manner

7.5 (0 - 7.5 points) (B) Staff experience/qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources, or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the project.

Comments Based on the description of qualifications with experience ranging from 10 - 29 years the applicant is well qualified to successfully achieve the project goals.

retired?

CRITERION SEVEN: Partnerships (15 points)

10 (0 - 15 points) Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well the applicant has demonstrated appropriate and necessary partnerships as described in Section IV.C.3.B.6, Partnership Information, to help perform the project. (Section IV.C.3.B.6, Partnership Information: Provide a clear description of the roles and responsibilities of specific partners in the project's components/tasks, and how these

partnerships will contribute to building a state/tribal/local government's wetland program. A **state/tribal /local government** applicant may describe how they will partner within their organization, or if appropriate, describe how having no partners is the best approach. If the applicant is an **interstate agency, intertribal consortium, or university** designated as an agency of a state government they should describe how they have already and/or will continue to partner (during the project) with the appropriate State/tribe/local government(s) in which the project is physically located, or where the results of the project are intended to be used. You may attach optional letters of support/commitment, from intended partners, to your proposal as supporting documents and they will not be counted in the 16-page limit for the proposal workplan. The letters should be submitted on the supporting organization's letterhead and may be addressed to the applicant.)

Comments The applicant provides a clear list of potential partners and their roles (+5). However, the roles are not clearly defined as related to the particular curriculum they may help develop for the training, the material they would discuss in presentation → i.e. how their participation relates back to specific tasks (-10) Nor does the applicant identify actual topics for potential

CRITERION EIGHT: Transfer of Results (5 points)

5 (0 - 5 points) Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on how well it demonstrates the applicant's plan for active transfer of project results and/or methods to other states or tribes within and beyond their own organization, so that the others can better build their wetland programs.

Comments Because the applicant will provide on-line access to materials, and will share summary training reports, and status and travel reports with municipal wetland agencies, partners etc. the applicant meets this criterion.

CRITERION NINE: Past Performance (10 points)

Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on the applicant's ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project taking into account their:

5 (0 - 5 points) (i) past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C. of the announcement.

Comments The applicant provided adequate information regarding past performance in completing and managing 4 prior WPDG projects

5 (0 - 5 points) (ii) history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV.C. of the announcement including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the

expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not.

Comments The applicant explained their history of meeting reporting requirements and explained that, when necessary, they sought no-cost extensions.

Note: In evaluating applicants under the subcriterion above, EPA will consider the information supplied by the applicant in its proposal, and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files (e.g., Grantee Compliance Database) and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided the by applicant). Applicants with no relevant or available past performance information will receive a neutral score for these factors (i.e., 2.5 points for subcriterion i and ii). Failure to provide any past performance information, or to include a statement in your proposal that you do not have any relevant or available past performance information, may result in a zero score for these factors.

Overall strengths of the proposal: _____

Overall weaknesses of the proposal:

Applicant needs to be more specific to regarding exactly what the trainings topics will be this year.